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I don't pretend to agree with, or be impartially responsible for, anything and everything that appears in any given issue of the ADFLY. I did nothing at all to do with the issue of two weeks ago (46), since I was occupied with work, so I'm not sure what went on, and missed the editorial meeting.

First of all, I see a hit on us by John Taylor's editorial entitled "Issues and Proposals at Bank: A Godfly Proposal," which pointedly failed to mention the actual reason for the action.

I didn't mind better, my main idea was publishing a letter, and the fact that it was published was a little bit of a surprise to me.

As far as I can gather, his admission is that the impossibility of our team running a "pass-fail" system has been discussed, and we should be thinking about the feasibility of the system and the secuinity of the system and the size of the system as the "pass-fail" system to the educational program.

Finance and Key, it seems implicit in any consideration of the "pass-fail" system that such questions would arise. Although I often disagree with S.D.s., and of the Observer, I don't question their intelligence, so convinced is Mr. Taylor to the fact that he is making it clear that even when discussion has been held. Further, he is raising the question of factors and "blinds" which have been taken place even if he had said nothing. If he really is "hardly doing to contribute to these discussions" but reluctant because we present no sufficient perspectives for the formation of opinion have been established, why should he try to form his perspectives? why didn't he try to answer some of the questions at all? Granted that the raising of questions in itself is a valuable exercise, when he raises questions about which he doesn't know at all how to discuss, he should take the initiative and explore some answers of his own, by some adverse comment, for instance, "Dear Tom, and Mrs. Jones," to prove that he can do so.

I see no urgent need for any such proposals.

It is my hope that this question may be raised, and it is my hope that this question may be raised. However, I see no urgent need for such a discussion, since it seems unnecessary in the circumstances.
The problem is that the librarians and the work-study students have too little time to do the work they need to do. This is not to say that the librarians and the work-study students are not doing a good job. They are just being asked to do too much. The problem is that the work-study students are not being paid enough to do the work they need to do. They are being asked to work for free, which is not fair.

The solution is to increase the number of work-study students and to increase the number of hours they work. This will allow the librarians to do their jobs properly and to provide good service to the students.

The librarians also need more time to do their work. They are being asked to do too many tasks in too little time. This is not fair to the librarians and it is not fair to the students.

The solution is to increase the number of librarians and to provide them with more time to do their work. This will allow the librarians to do their jobs properly and to provide good service to the students.

In conclusion, the problem is that the librarians and the work-study students are not being paid enough to do the work they need to do. They are being asked to work for free, which is not fair. The solution is to increase the number of work-study students and to increase the number of hours they work. This will allow the librarians to do their jobs properly and to provide good service to the students.